

# Interview Summary

Application No.

09/901,097

Applicant(s)

MIYASHITA ET AL.0101

Examiner

D. Lawrence Tarazano

Art Unit

1773

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) D. Lawrence Tarazano.

(3) William Berridge, Chris Tierney.

(2) Takashi Miyazawa.

(4) Eric Morehouse, Gerooge Simion.

Date of Interview: 9/8/2008

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant

2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: See Continuation Sheet.

Claim(s) discussed: claims of record.

Identification of prior art discussed: art of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see above.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

**D. LAWRENCE TARAZANO**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted, If Yes, brief description:

The examiner stated that he would consider the applicants arguments. Since the instant specification is directed to an EL device, the examiner feels that the applicants have support for claims 27, 30-34, 36-46, and 76 because the specification describes materials having a band gap and in view of the arguments stated in the last response. Claims 54-75 and 77 relate to the use of polyvinylcarbazol polymers and these are commensurate in scope with the instant disclosure. The examiner also feels that claim 78 is supported because of the list of materials used are directly from the specification. The examiner is not convinced at this time that there is support for claims 25, 26, 29, and 35 but may reconsider his position. Claim 28 may need some additional explanation since Shirasaki describes conductive materials.

**D. LAWRENCE TARAZANO**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**